CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

1516 NINTH STREET SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-5512



NOTICE OF PROPOSED AWARD Financial Advisor for the Bond Program RFP # 600-10-613

Proposed Contractor: Lamont Financial Services Corporation

30 Two Bridges Road, Suite 205

Fairfield, NJ 07004

Contract Amount: \$110,000

BIDDER	<u>FINAL SCORE</u>
Montague DeRose & Associates	875.70
Lamont Financial Services Corporations	894.00
Public Financial Management, Inc.	777.67

Questions should be directed to: Rachel Grant, Contract Officer

California Energy Commission 1516 Ninth Street, MS-18 Sacramento, CA 95814

(916) 654-4379

Dated: July 7, 2011 Expires: July 14, 2011

Proposal #1 Mont	Proposal #1 Montague DeRose & Associates									
Criteria .		Scorer 2		Average	Weight	AVG TOTAL				
A. General Approach to Scope of Work										
Overall response to the work statement: •										
Clarity, succinctness and organization of Proposal	7	9	7	7.67	6	46				
Innovative approaches to work tasks	8	7	9	8	6	48				
B. Approach to Tasks in the Scope of Work										
 Demonstrated understanding of bond program structure, flow of funds, investments, cash-flow strategies, overall funding efficiency Demonstrated ability to provide programmatic advice, monitoring of investments, future scenario risk assessment, and document covenant interpretation 	8	9	7	8	8	64				
 Demonstrated knowledge of compliance requirements, auditing, rebate and tax issues, document covenant interpretation Understanding of parties involved in bond compliance issues; auditor, rebate specialist, bond counsel, issuer 	9	9	7	8.33	8	66.67				
3.Demonstrated understanding of auditing requirements and ability to support Commission in resolving audit preparation procedures	8	9	8	8.33	9	75				

Proposal #1 Monta	Proposal #1 Montague DeRose & Associates						
Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Average	Weight	AVG TOTAL	
 4. Demonstrates thorough understanding of all aspects of bond issuance steps and parties involved Understanding of scenario analysis for bond sizing, market demand and market timing Knowledge of municipal financing structures 	8	9	7	8	9	72	
C. Client References							
 Strength of Reference and Credibility Relevance of references to Work Statement tasks Validation of experience and performance as reflected in client reference questions 	9	9	8	8.67	3	26	
D. Firm & Staff Qualifications			J	0.07		20	
 Awards and achievements received Team knowledge of State revenue bond issue procedures Length of time Team has performed financial advisory services for State issued revenue bonds Availability of Team members to work on the Energy Commission contract Qualifications of Team members performing the tasks described in the Scope of Work. Relevance of recently completed work as it relates to this Scope of Work. Location of satellite offices and headquarters, and recommended approach to minimize costs to the State. 	8	9		8	12	96	

Proposal #1 Montague DeRose & Associates								
Criteria .			Scorer 3	Average	Weight	AVG TOTAL		
E. Experience								
 Overall relevant financial experience of staff 								
 Experience with bond issues similar to the Energy 								
Commission's Master Trust Revenue Bonds								
 Technical knowledge to complete quantitative 								
tasks								
	8	9	7	8	9	72		
F. Cost Effectiveness			•					
1. Average Hourly Rate. The Score for this criteria								
will be derived from the mathematical formula set								
forth below, which compares the cumulative								
average hourly rate of all hourly rates listed in the								
subject Bidder's Cost Bid, with the cumulative								
average hourly rate of all hourly rates listed in the								
Lowest Bidder's cost bid .	9.1	9.1	9.1	9.1	20	182		
2. Justification. Bidder has justified all proposed								
personnel identified in its bid for all technical areas								
and functions to be performed by Prime and Team								
Members.	9	8	8	8.33	10	83.33		
Total Proposal 1	91.1	96.1	84.1	90.43		831		

Proposal #2 Lamont Financial Services Corporation									
Criteria	iteria Scorer 1 Scorer 2 Scorer 3 Average W								
A. General Approach to Scope of Work									
Overall response to the work statement: •									
Clarity, succinctness and organization of Proposal	8	10	8	8.67	6	52			
Innovative approaches to work tasks	8	7	7	7.33	6	44			
B. Approach to Tasks in the Scope of Work									
 1. Demonstrated understanding of bond program structure, flow of funds, investments, cash-flow strategies, overall funding efficiency Demonstrated ability to provide programmatic advice, monitoring of investments, future scenario risk assessment, and document covenant interpretation 	9	10	8	9	8	72			
2. Demonstrated knowledge of compliance requirements, auditing, rebate and tax issues, document covenant interpretation Understanding of parties involved in bond compliance issues; auditor, rebate specialist, bond counsel, issuer	9	10	8	9	8	72			
3.Demonstrated understanding of auditing requirements and ability to support Commission in resolving audit preparation procedures	9	10	8	9	9	81			

Proposal #2 Lamont Financial Services Corporation						
Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Average	Weight	AVG TOTAL
 4. Demonstrates thorough understanding of all aspects of bond issuance steps and parties involved Understanding of scenario analysis for bond sizing, market demand and market timing Knowledge of municipal financing structures 	8	10	8	8.67	9	78
C. Client References						
 Strength of Reference and Credibility Relevance of references to Work Statement tasks Validation of experience and performance as reflected in client reference questions 	9	10	8	9	3	27
D. Firm & Staff Qualifications						
 Awards and achievements received Team knowledge of State revenue bond issue procedures Length of time Team has performed financial advisory services for State issued revenue bonds Availability of Team members to work on the Energy Commission contract Qualifications of Team members performing the tasks described in the Scope of Work. Relevance of recently completed work as it relates to this Scope of Work. Location of satellite offices and headquarters, and recommended approach to minimize costs to the State. 	9	9	8	8.67	12	104

Proposal #2 Lamont Financial Services Corporation								
Criteria		Scorer 2			Weight	AVG TOTAL		
E. Experience								
 Overall relevant financial experience of staff 								
 Experience with bond issues similar to the Energy 								
Commission's Master Trust Revenue Bonds								
 Technical knowledge to complete quantitative 								
tasks								
	9	10	9	9.33	9	84		
F. Cost Effectiveness					•			
1. Average Hourly Rate. The Score for this criteria								
will be derived from the mathematical formula set								
forth below, which compares the cumulative								
average hourly rate of all hourly rates listed in the								
subject Bidder's Cost Bid, with the cumulative								
average hourly rate of all hourly rates listed in the								
Lowest Bidder's cost bid .	10	10	10	10	20	200		
2. Justification. Bidder has justified all proposed								
personnel identified in its bid for all technical areas								
and functions to be performed by Prime and Team								
Members.	8	9	7	8	10	80		
Total Proposal 2	96	105	89	96.67		894		

Proposal #3 Public Financial Management, Inc.											
Proposal #3 Public	Financial	Managen	nent, Inc.								
Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Average	Weight	AVG TOTAL					
A. General Approach to Scope of Work											
Overall response to the work statement: •											
Clarity, succinctness and organization of Proposal	8	7	6	7	6	42					
Innovative approaches to work tasks	7	7	7	7	6	42					
B. Approach to Tasks in the Scope of Work											
 1. Demonstrated understanding of bond program structure, flow of funds, investments, cash-flow strategies, overall funding efficiency Demonstrated ability to provide programmatic advice, monitoring of investments, future scenario risk assessment, and document covenant interpretation 	8	9	9	8.67	8	69.33					
 Demonstrated knowledge of compliance requirements, auditing, rebate and tax issues, document covenant interpretation Understanding of parties involved in bond compliance issues; auditor, rebate specialist, bond counsel, issuer 	8	9	8	8.33	8	66.67					
 Demonstrated understanding of auditing requirements and ability to support Commission in resolving audit preparation procedures 	8	8	8	8	9	72					

Proposal #3 Public Financial Management, Inc.						
Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Average	Weight	AVG TOTAL
 4. Demonstrates thorough understanding of all aspects of bond issuance steps and parties involved Understanding of scenario analysis for bond sizing, market demand and market timing 						
 Knowledge of municipal financing structures C. Client References 	8	8	7	7.67	9	69
 Strength of Reference and Credibility Relevance of references to Work Statement tasks Validation of experience and performance as reflected in client reference questions 						
D. Firm & Staff Qualifications	8	7	7	7.33	3	22
 Awards and achievements received Team knowledge of State revenue bond issue procedures Length of time Team has performed financial advisory services for State issued revenue bonds Availability of Team members to work on the Energy Commission contract Qualifications of Team members performing the tasks described in the Scope of Work. Relevance of recently completed work as it relates to this Scope of Work. Location of satellite offices and headquarters, and recommended approach to minimize costs to the State. 	7	7	6	6.67	12	80

Summary								
Proposal #3 Public	Financial	Managen	nent, Inc.					
Criteria	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Average	Weight	AVG TOTAL		
E. Experience								
 Overall relevant financial experience of staff Experience with bond issues similar to the Energy Commission's Master Trust Revenue Bonds Technical knowledge to complete quantitative 								
tasks	7	7	6	6.67	9	60		
F. Cost Effectiveness								
1. Average Hourly Rate. The Score for this criteria will be derived from the mathematical formula set forth below, which compares the cumulative average hourly rate of all hourly rates listed in the subject Bidder's Cost Bid, with the cumulative average hourly rate of all hourly rates listed in the								
Lowest Bidder's cost bid .	8.9	8.9	8.9	8.9	20	178		
2. Justification. Bidder has justified all proposed personnel identified in its bid for all technical areas and functions to be performed by Prime and Team								
Members.	7	5	5	5.67	10	56.67		
Total Proposal 3	84.9	82.9	77.9	81.9		757.67		

RFP 600-10-613 Financial Advisor for the Bond Program Final Summary with Preferences

Proposal			Small/Micro Pref	Non-Small		Final Score	Rank
Proposal #1 Montague DeRose & Associates	831	0	44.7	0	0	875.70	2
Proposal #2 Lamont Financial Services Corporation	894	0	0	0	0	894.00	1
Proposal #3 Public Financial Management, Inc.	757.67	20	0	0	0	777.67	3